

A CHARGE
DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY
AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 1880,

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

[PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIOCESAN SYNOD.]

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY BAILLIE & ANDERSON, 161 HOLLIS STREET.
1880.

A
BX5612
H3B5
1880

DE

The

HIBBE

PRIN

A
273.7
152

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 1880,

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

[PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIOCESAN SYNOD.]

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY BAILLIE & ANDERSON, 161 HOLLIS STREET,

1880.

The members of the Synod are informed, that the delay, in the publication of this Charge, has been caused by the Bishop's absence from Halifax.

A
BX5612
.H3B5
1880

2
My REV

Acco
have be
consequ
for hold
as there
deferred
you mig
purposes
journey.

We h
the prev
of their
Selwyn,
of New
1841, th
whole o
time bein
had incre
as a patte
and skilf
to all pe
It will be
America
particular
and havin
to be of
away a fe
in 1878, f

A CHARGE.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—

According to the custom of this Diocese, you should have been summoned to attend here two years ago, but in consequence of my absence in England at the usual time for holding my Visitation, I was unable to meet you; and, as there was not any session of our Synod last year, I have deferred the Visitation until this summer, in order that you might make one visit to the city suffice for two purposes, and be spared the inconvenience of a second journey.

We have, as usual, to commemorate some who, since the previous Visitation, have been removed from the scene of their labors, and foremost among them George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop of Lichfield, far better known as Bishop of New Zealand, to which Diocese he was consecrated in 1841, the first Bishop sent to the Southern Ocean, the whole of our Colonial and Missionary Dioceses at that time being eleven, whereas at the date of his death they had increased to sixty-one. He has been rightly regarded as a pattern of a Missionary Bishop, indefatigable, earnest, and skilful in adapting himself to all circumstances, and to all persons with whom he was brought into contact. It will be remembered that he twice visited British North America and the United States, with reference, more particularly, to a second Conference of Bishops at Lambeth. and having accomplished the object, which he considered to be of great importance to the Church, he was taken away a few months before the assembling of the Conference in 1878, for which he had been preparing, having issued

invitations to many of us to spend a few days with him at Lichfield before the day of meeting.

Next to the name of Selwyn, that of Feild was probably best known and most highly esteemed on the list of Colonial Bishops. We are naturally more particularly interested in his labors because he was personally known at least by sight, to many of us, and because those among whom he ministered are our near neighbors, with whom we have direct intercourse. His last illness was probably to be attributed to overtasking his strength in the early part of 1875, by undertaking the work of a country mission in very severe weather, in order to allow the incumbent to proceed to England for medical advice. He has left a remarkable pattern of self-denial, and abnegation of self-indulgence of every kind, as one who felt that the servant of the Lord must endure hardness. He expected much from all his clergy, but he was himself always an example of what he required from them.

These are outside of our own Ecclesiastical Province and I fear that Newfoundland must remain outside, the obstacles in the way of including it being almost insuperable, although the position of Dioceses thus isolated is unsatisfactory to themselves, and an infringement of the Provincial system, approved by the Lambeth Conferences. But there have been also changes in this Province, the then Metropolitan having returned to England, and the venerable Bishop of Toronto having been removed by death, while the new Diocese of Niagara has been created. The Bishops now occupying these Sees have all been directly elected by the Synods of the respective Dioceses, the former complicated system of election for the See of Montreal having been abolished, and the Bishop of Fredericton having been elected Metropolitan by the House of Bishops. This is not the place for a discussion of the merits of this system, and I am unable to suggest any better; but I may say that, from observation of the elections in the neighboring States, as well as from our

with his own experience, the man who would be the first choice of any one party is never likely to be actually elected.

We have lost by death and by removal thirty-two, and have added to our number thirty-three, twenty-six by ordination of Deacons, and seven who have come in from other Dioceses, so that we are nearly in the same position in which we were at the beginning of the period; but we ought to have increased, and I fear that the means of supporting additional clergy are even less than they were six years ago.

Within a few weeks one of our veterans has been taken from us in a good old age, after 56 years of service in the vineyard. James Cuppaidge Cochran is a name that has gained an enduring place in our annals, and we trust that his example may inspire many followers. He was in labors most abundant, and now he is at rest, and his works are still before us as evidences of his zeal and perseverance. You, my younger brethren, when you are disposed to complain of the hardness of your lot, and of the difficulty of laboring in some of our country districts, should look back and consider how much more difficult was, in the early days, the work of those who have now grown grey in their Master's service, or who, after many years of arduous labors, have entered into their rest.

The great event of the period, regarded in its relation to the Church, has been the second Lambeth Conference, which, according to the understanding at the first Conference, should have been held in 1877, but was deferred, because in that year the meetings of Synods and Conventions in other parts of the world, in the United States, in Canada, and in New Zealand, would have prevented the attendance of many of the Bishops. Moreover, dissatisfaction had been expressed at some of the restrictions imposed upon the former Conference, and an indisposition to attend on the part of our brethren in the United States was apprehended, but all difficulties were removed by the intervention of the Bishop of Lichfield, to which I have already referred; and on St. Peter's Day, 1878, the Arch-

bishop, sitting in St. Augustine's stone chair in the Cathedral of Canterbury, received the Bishops who had come, some of them from the antipodes, to attend the Conference. There were, however, present on this occasion less than forty, including only five of the English Bishops. St. Peter's Day is annually observed at St. Augustine's College by the commemoration of founders and benefactors, and we assembled there at the special service in the morning, the occasion being of peculiar interest, as it was the termination of the 25 years' labors of the Warden, Dr. Bailey, to whom the Colonial Church is deeply indebted for the many useful Missionaries prepared under his guidance, and sent forth to minister in all parts of the world.

On Tuesday, July 2nd, the Conference was opened with celebration of Holy Communion in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, and a sermon by the Archbishop of York; and in the afternoon we commenced the transaction of business. At this meeting many were wanting who, at the first Conference, had taken an active part. The Archbishop who at that time presided, and the three Metropolitans of Montreal, New Zealand, and South Africa, with the Bishop of Oxford, and many others, had passed away; but whereas the whole number was then less than 80, this Conference was attended by exactly 100 Bishops, including the Archbishop and Bishops of the Northern Province, who had on the former occasion declined to take part. Still there were many absentees, and the one hundred represented nearly double that number of Bishops of the Anglican Church or in communion with her. Such an assembly could not be gathered together without exercising an influence upon the whole body thus represented, and especially it manifested the true unity of the widely separated parts of the great Anglican body dispersed, in fact, throughout the world. The sentiments expressed by the chief recognized organs of public opinion attested the change of feeling since the first Conference, and the growing conviction of the importance of such assemblies

Thus especially the "Times," which in 1867 treated the whole with contempt, as a pretentious experiment ending in failure, said of this, "Whatever may be the result of the mere formal work, we are well satisfied that the Conference itself has not, and cannot have, been without its fruits of one kind or another." "The Lambeth Conference is most properly a great demonstration of what the English Church has grown to be. It helps us all to feel that our national form of religion is a vast and widely-spreading influence, co-extensive with our race, and dependent upon something better and more enduring than the accidents of place or establishment."

The chief impediment to the action of these Conferences is probably the position of the Church of England as established, so that the Archbishop of Canterbury does not venture to allow the free, unrestricted discussion of subjects of general interest, which would otherwise be most desirable; and one of the Committees suggested that "such Conferences call together from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the request of, or in consultation with, the Bishops of our communion, might with advantage be invested in future with somewhat larger liberty, as to the initiation and selection of subjects for discussion." This, too, is the great impediment to the formation of any *authoritative* assembly, such as has been proposed, for, if all were equally free, there could not be much difficulty in forming a Council, of which the decisions should only be obligatory so far as they might be adopted by the Provincial Synods.

The Bishops from the United States who attended have spoken very warmly since their return of the kindly greeting with which they were everywhere received, and particularly have expressed their conviction and admiration of the prevailing life and power of the Church in England. I venture to quote, as an illustration, the eloquent words of one* who, together with the name, has

* Doane, Bishop of Albany, Address 1879.

inherited his father's reputation and ability: "I felt that I must be more of a Bishop and more of a man from the baptism of the power of the second Lambeth Conference, because in size, in spirit, in character, in representative extent, in loving brotherliness, in single mindedness, in unity, in ability, in intellectuality, in spirituality, from beginning to end, it made me know as I never knew before the meaning of the Creed's outburst of proud and joyful faith, as much part of every whole belief as the first article, 'I believe in one holy catholic and Apostolic Church.' I would to God that some magnetic power were mine to thrill this message, and the meaning of it, into all the hearts that were not there."

The proceedings of this Conference differed from the first, in that arrangements were made for the reference to Committees of subjects discussed in the first week, and for the consideration of the reports of those Committees at the end of the month. Six Committees were appointed, but of these only five reported, the other having found the time too short to admit of a satisfactory report, although the subject was the most important of all those submitted to us; "modern forms of infidelity, and the best mode of dealing with them." The report on "the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican communion," is that in which *we* are chiefly interested. And among other things, it is recommended to use the Prayer for Unity on the Day of Intercession for Missions, with these observations: "As our Divine Lord has so closely connected the unity of His followers with the world's belief in His own Mission from the Father, it seems to us that intercessions for the enlargement of His Kingdom may well be joined, with earnest prayer, that all who profess faith in Him may be one flock under one Shepherd."

In this report the essential unity of the several branches is thankfully recognized, in that "they teach the same Word of God, partake of the same Divinely-ordained Sacraments through the ministry of the same Apostolic

orders, and worship one God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit." At the same time it is admitted that there may be need of some provision to prevent serious differences as the several branches become more independent, and exercise their right to adapt their system of discipline and orders of worship to their particular circumstances. And, inasmuch as a true General Council, or even a Synod of all the Anglican Churches, is now practically impossible, such a Conference of the same character as those which have been already held, is suggested as the best resource, with some extension and improvement in details.

"They believe that the internal unity of the several Churches will help greatly to the union of these one with another. And, while they consider that such large elasticity in the forms of worship is desirable as will give wide scope to all legitimate expressions of devotional feeling, they would appeal on the other hand to the Apostolic precept that all things be done unto edifying; and to the Catholic principle, that order and obedience, even at the sacrifice of personal preferences and tastes, lie at the foundation of Christian unity."

The importance of letters commendatory from clergymen to members of their flocks going from one country to another, is emphatically urged. The Committee considers it desirable that the clergy should urge on such persons the duty of promptly presenting these letters, and should carefully instruct them as to the oneness of the Church in its Apostolic constitution under its varying organizations and conditions. I would specially enforce this recommendation; you, my Rev. brethren, have many persons migrating from your Missions, and you may do good service to them and to the Church by taking steps to secure for them, as far as you can, pastoral care in the places where their lot may be cast. The prompt presentation of the letters to the clergyman of the Church in which they are likely to worship is a matter of primary importance, for otherwise they will probably not be presented at all.

The question of the constitution of voluntary boards of arbitration, discussed in 1867, was again considered, and the conclusion was that any Ecclesiastical Province desiring to have a Council to which it may refer in matters of doctrine, must determine for itself the conditions of reference. And inasmuch as the Provincial Tribunal, which in other cases is only a Court of Appeal, must, in the case of a trial of a Bishop, be a tribunal of first instance, there should in that case be some provision for a revision of its decisions.

Several questions respecting Missionaries and Missionary Bishops, and the adoption of Books of Common Prayer for foreign countries, were considered at length, but as we are not particularly affected by the resolutions I will not further refer to them.

There was a Committee appointed, to receive questions submitted to them in writing by Bishops desiring the advice of the Conference, on difficulties or problems they have met with in their respective Dioceses, and to report thereon. This opened the door for the introduction of many subjects not comprised in the original programme, among which the following were considered: The position which the Anglican Church should assume towards the "Old Catholics;" local peculiarities regarding the laws of marriage; difficulties arising in the Church of England from the revival of obsolete forms of ritual, and from erroneous teaching on the subject of confession.

The Committee report with reference to the first: "All sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the churches and individuals protesting against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and the novel doctrines promulgated by its authority. We gladly welcome every effort to reform upon the model of the primitive Church. We do not demand a rigid uniformity; we deprecate needless divisions, but to those who are drawn to us in the endeavor to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition, we are ready to offer all help and such privileges as may be acceptable

to them, and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles as enunciated in our formularies."

With reference to marriage, the conclusion is that "steps should be taken by each branch of the Church, according to its own discretion, to maintain the sanctity of marriage agreeably to the principles set forth in the Word of God, as the Church of Christ hath hitherto received the same." You are all aware that we are threatened with legislation sanctioning what is contrary to the Word of God as understood by the Church, of which I will speak to you afterwards, and this exhortation of the Conference may be a useful guide to us.

The last portion of the report treats of a subject, to the introduction of which, in this manner, I and many others objected. It had been generally understood, and indeed officially stated, that what were called "burning questions" were not to be introduced. We were ready to discuss these questions fully; but it was felt by many that their importance demanded full and deliberate consideration if they were introduced at all, and that they would not be satisfactorily disposed of at the end of the Session; and a disposition was manifested to oppose the reception of this part of the report altogether, but a compromise was effected by the introduction of alterations, so extensive as in fact materially to alter its complexion. No one can, I think, reasonably object to the principle that "no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the Diocese," if the authority of the Bishop is to be regarded at all. This is very different from the resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury which we were at first asked to endorse, which made the "sanction of the Bishop necessary for every alteration." The Priest in charge of each congregation is thus left to act upon his own responsibility, subject to the right of the Bishop to interfere where it appears to him to be expedient to do so. The report upon Confession was also materially modified, especially by the addition of the words, "Your Committee are not to be understood as desir-

ing to limit, in any way, the provision made in the Book of Common Prayer for the relief of troubled consciences ;" but as I treated this subject at some length in my last Charge in 1874, I need not enlarge upon it now.

In dealing with the excesses and shortcomings of the clergy, I thought that we ought first to consider our own ways, that an Assembly of Bishops was the very place where, with the utmost propriety, our own obligations should have been considered and formally acknowledged. There are many points, in which most, if not all, of the Bishops of the Anglican communion habitually violate the laws of the Church when officiating, and I could not conscientiously join in the condemnation of Priests for the transgression of laws which the Bishops systematically disregard. The Committee of the Privy Council, in the Ridsdale case, appeared to be much influenced by the argument that the existence of a law enjoining the use of the vestments was incompatible with the fact of their disuse ; but this argument is refuted by the fact that the indisputable law of the 24th Canon has been, and is, habitually disregarded by Bishops and dignitaries of Cathedrals, who ought to be even more strict than the Parochial Clergy in such observances.

Many of the Bishops wished for the issue of an Encyclical address, as at the previous Conference, but this was opposed by others, and finally it was determined to issue the reports as revised, embodied in a letter, of which this is the conclusion : " We do not claim to be lords over God's heritage, but we commend the results of this our Conference to the reason and conscience of our brethren, as enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God, praying that all throughout the world who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be of one mind, may be united in one fellowship, may hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, and worship their one Lord in the spirit of purity and love."

I have mentioned the recommendation that the Tuesday before Ascension Day being one of the Rogation Days, or

any of the next seven days, should be annually observed as a Day of Intercession for Missions. In deference to the Conference, we shall observe the day named; but I do not approve of it, and I opposed the recommendation, for it clashes with the efforts now generally made to secure a proper observance of Ascension Day, too long neglected. The suggestion was, at my instance, referred back to the Committee, but they again reported to the same effect. The time appointed is good in itself, as the sending forth of laborers and the gifts bestowed are closely connected with the Ascension of our Lord, and the Rogation Days are most appropriate for special intercessions; but we have to consider what is practically as well as theoretically best, and I fear that it is vain to expect people, constituted as they are, to pay much attention to the appointment of the Day of Intercession and *also* to the Day of the Ascension, when only separated by the brief space of one day. It is true that any one of the seven days following may be selected, but the force of the appeal is much strengthened by the supposition that the members of the Anglican communion throughout the whole world are uniting, on one specified day, in these special intercessions.

In any case, I hope, my Rev. brethren, that you are all endeavoring to lead your people to a right estimate and due observance of the great Festival of the Ascension, according to the intention of the Church, which has appointed proper Psalms, and also a proper preface in the office of the Holy Communion. The appointment of Fast and Festival, to be observed in their places throughout the year, ought to be a help to the spiritual life, and must be so when rightly regarded. They are part of the Church's system, which must be used in its integrity if we would rightly profit by it, and it is your duty to enforce, from time to time, the observance of these appointed days, and to explain the reasons therefor. St. Paul did not hesitate to exhort his fellow Christians to follow him as he followed Christ, and meditation upon the lives and examples of the Saints should be beneficial to all. But especially the days

observed in commemoration of events in the earthly life of our Blessed Lord ought to be observed. Our life should be closely connected with His, from His birth to His Ascension. We, year by year commemorating the leading events, have our grasp of the doctrines strengthened by the contemplation of the facts, so that we are more deeply impressed with the reality of His Passion and the truth of His Resurrection and Ascension, so that we thus know more perfectly than we could otherwise both "the fellowship of His sufferings and the power of His resurrection." If we would reign with Christ, we must also suffer with Him. We should fast as He fasted if we would triumph as He triumphed. We are to have our conversation in Heaven; and commemorating His Ascension we are aided in our endeavors, to ascend with Him in heart and mind, and to realize the truth that "this same Jesus, who was taken up into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as we have seen Him go into Heaven." I am persuaded, my brethren, that you do injustice to your flocks, and deprive them of a great blessing, if you neglect to bring before them the duty and privilege of observing the appointed days and seasons according to the wise arrangement of the Church.

The neglect of the Festival of the Ascension, which has been too common, is probably to be attributed to the fact that the State has not marked it to be publicly observed like Christmas Day and Good Friday. But it is sad that the Church should be thus guided by the world in a matter in which there should be an essential distinction. We can understand why there should be a universal recognition, even by the world, of the birth of a Saviour, and of His death for our redemption; but the teaching of the Ascension is altogether foreign to the sentiments of the world. What has the world to do with "sitting in Heavenly places?" with the injunction "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God?" Only as we grow in grace can we thoroughly enter into the spirit of the commemoration, and rejoice in

the consequences, of the Ascension. And as time passes, and we are more deeply impressed with the belief that the end of all things is at hand, while we look for the appearing of the Lord, we cannot but recognize the propriety of commemorating His Ascension by celebrating the Holy Eucharist with joy and thankfulness, by eating of that bread and drinking of that cup, whereby "we do shew the Lord's death till He come." And, inasmuch as there is no general cessation from work on that day, the celebration must be at an early hour, if they whose time is not at their own disposal are to be enabled to enjoy the privilege.

Speaking of early celebrations, I am happy to find that they are becoming more common even in country Parishes. And although objections will ever be raised by some who would prefer to spend the early hours of the Lord's Day in their beds, the earnest worshippers generally agree that they are able to enjoy more thoroughly the divine service, while they are fresh and their thoughts are entirely occupied with the one subject, than at a later hour after long prayers and sermon. With respect to fasting communion, a caution is necessary for some persons. It is a goodly custom of the Church, to be observed as far as possible, to receive the Holy Communion fasting, but with some this becomes a superstition, and leads to a neglect of the divine institution. One reason alleged for a strict observance of this rule, that the sacred food should not be mingled with ordinary meat, is unmeaning unless it be combined with abstinence from such meat for some hours also *after* the partaking. Moreover, in some cases persons are so misguided that when they cannot communicate fasting they will refuse to communicate at all, "making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions," and "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Rather than violate a rule, or tradition, of the Church, when they are obliged to do the one or the other, they disregard the positive injunction of their Lord; they actually turn their backs upon the Holy Table, they refuse

to partake of that sacred feast, in which He has promised to impart Himself to us. Now, while we attach due importance to the practice of the Church, continued through many ages, and must, for this and other reasons, condemn the innovation of evening communions, ignorantly or perversely introduced in some places, we cannot admit that adherence to a rule of the Church is to be approved if it involves a breach of God's law, or through circumstances becomes in any case injurious. Even when the celebration is late, they who are able, without ill effects to refrain from taking food until after the reception, may well do so; but if such abstinence so affects the body that the capacity for thought, and prayer, and spiritual effort is thereby diminished, then it is far better to take what is needful, remembering who hath said, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." It is true that some persons, unwilling to exercise self-denial, will refuse to abstain, when they might do so without injury; but I am persuaded that if you enforce the duty of fasting communion, unless you provide early celebrations, you will induce persons who would otherwise communicate to content themselves with being present. And I repeat the warning, addressed to you ten years ago, to beware of encouraging your people to suppose that they may derive the benefits intended to be conveyed by the feast upon the sacrifice through their presence, when they do not actually partake of the feast. St. Paul teaches us that they who are partakers of the consecrated bread and cup, being partakers of the Lord's table, are partakers of Him whose sacrifice is *there* represented, but he does not hint at any benefit to be enjoyed by those who do not actually eat of that bread or drink of that cup.

There has been of late years a gratifying improvement with respect to the facilities offered to our communicants, but still there is a defect, and, although the return of only four celebrations in the year in a Parish is exceptional, there are still several Parishes, containing more than one church, where each church has only a quarterly commu-

nion. And, even where there is a monthly celebration, as some of the communicants will probably be unable to attend on each occasion, an adequate provision is not made. If we truly believe, as affirmed in the exhortation in our Office, that "the benefit is great, if, with a true penitent heart and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament," we can hardly fail to perceive that it is our duty, if possible, to enable *every* member of our flocks to conform to the Scriptural pattern, by inviting them to the sacred feast, that they may take part in that memorial of His precious sacrifice, which He hath commanded us to make, on the first day of every week.

It has been my practice to mention any cases decided in the Ecclesiastical Courts in England, when we may be at all affected by the decisions; and I should have been glad if there had been nothing to report under this head since the last visitation. But we have not yet regained that happy, peaceful condition of the past ages, in which prosecutions in the Ecclesiastical Courts for violations of the rubrics were almost unknown. In fact, during the past six years we may say that there has been no interruption, no period in which there was no case before the Courts, for in the year 1874 the Public Worship Regulation Bill was passed, which has given much encouragement to such litigation. Since the date of my last Charge, judgment has been delivered by Sir R. Phillimore, in the Arches Court, that paintings and sculpture not likely to be abused as objects of adoration may lawfully be used as ornaments in Parish Churches, (which was confirmed on appeal by the Committee of Council); and in another case, that a person denying the existence of the Devil, and the doctrine of eternal punishment, and condemning the tone and tendency of certain portions of the Bible, might legally be repelled from the Holy Communion. This was reversed on appeal by the Privy Council, and the clergyman, Rev. Flavel Cooke, who was thus required to receive the offender as a communicant, resigned his Parish in preference to submitting to such ruling.

In 1875, Sir R. Phillimore resigned his office of Dean of the Arches Court, in which he is supposed to have been succeeded, under the Act of Parliament, by Lord Penzance; but the nature of this appointment has been disputed, as it is averred that he is not in reality Judge of the Arches Court as a spiritual Court, but is exercising merely a new Parliamentary jurisdiction, to which some of our Brethren believe that they cannot conscientiously submit. To us, this question is chiefly of importance, with reference to the opinion to be formed concerning the conduct of these brethren, since we do not admit that we are bound by the decisions of the Arches Court, except so far as they may help us to obtain the true interpretation of the laws of the Church. We cannot, however, deny that, when these interpretations are confirmed by the Court of Appeal, they have great moral weight, and ought to be accepted, if we have reason to believe that they are the honest expression of the enlightened judgments of men learned in the Law.

The most important case, decided by the Committee of the Privy Council, is that commonly called the Folkestone case in 1877, in which Mr. Ridsdale appealed against the decision of Lord Penzance, with reference to the use of vestments, the Eastward position, and wafer bread. The Court was numerous, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and four Bishops as Episcopal Assessors, but it seems to me, after carefully examining the judgment, more than probable that it was dictated rather by policy than according to the convictions of the learned judges. I would not presume to make such a statement, without higher authority than my own, but we have to that effect the very high authority of the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, who, (together with Sir R. Phillimore and Sir R. Amphlett), absented himself from the delivery of the judgment, and publicly expressed this opinion. Assuming that a certain foregone conclusion had to be supported, the argument is subtle and able; but I do not believe that any such conclusion could have been inferred from the premises by any legitimate

process. The judgments of the Committee of Council must ever be less satisfactory than those of any other Court, because the members do not severally declare their opinions, and it has been laid down that a member may not even divulge the fact that he dissented from the judgment of the majority. In consequence of the action of the Chief Baron in making known his dissent, an order was issued by the late Lord Chancellor, in the name of the Queen, prohibiting any such disclosures, and I cannot but marvel, that Englishmen are content to endure the existence of a Court under such regulations. In other Courts, and even in the House of Lords, sitting as a Court of Appeal, the Judges give their opinions *seriatim*; and the value of the judgment can thus be ascertained, but in the Committee of Council, the judgment may be determined by a majority of *one*, while the minority may be composed of men, whose judgment is far more weighty than that of the numerical majority.

It would occupy too much time if I were fully to discuss the judgment in the Folkestone case; but having myself expended a good deal of time upon it, I must express my astonishment that such statements and arguments could ever have been uttered by English judges. They appear to have made up their minds that the ornaments' rubric, in its plain literal sense, *could not* now be in force, and then they were obliged to find some kind of proof of this opinion.

At the Savoy Conference, the Puritans objected to that rubric, that it seemed to bring back the vestraents prohibited in the second book of Edward VI.; so that the attention of the Bishops was specially directed to its apparent meaning, and yet they replied, "we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is." But they did not leave it exactly as it was, *enforcing* the use of the vestments; they altered it to more general terms, providing for the retention, and the use where practicable, of those ornaments. And the fair inference is that this change was purposely adopted, in order to provide at some

future time for the resumption of vestments which could not then be enforced without danger to the peace of the Church. For Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, they were specifically enjoined by the Canon, which had then been in existence nearly 60 years, so that there could be no sufficient reason for objecting to them in the Parish Churches. If the adoption of the modifications, ordered by the advertisements, had been intended, surely this intention would have been distinctly expressed, whereas, according to the theory on which the judgment proceeds, the rubric, as published in 1662, is calculated rather to mislead than to instruct. It is incredible that such distinguished men as took part in that Conference, would deliberately remodel and republish a rubric which, according to the views of the Lords of the Council, either had no meaning at all, or meant something entirely different from what was expressed. I have treated of this matter, not because I would have the use of the vestments revived, but because I think that our brethren are very hardly treated, when condemned and stigmatized as lawless because they act upon the natural interpretation and self-evident meaning of the rubric, believing themselves to be thus conforming to the law, which they admit that they are bound to obey. They believe that usages, venerable by their antiquity, had become obsolete during years of coldness and indifference, but that they ought to be revived as a part of our inheritance, and they will not recognize as authoritative the decisions of prejudiced judges. We owe our national liberties, in some important respects, to the determination of those who, in former ages, refused to submit to perverted judgments, and we call them *not* "lawless," but patriots and martyrs. I am not aware that Crammer thought himself bound to resign his Archbishopric, when he found that he could not obey the law. I do not say that these men are right, and I think that some of them are acting injudiciously, but I believe that they are persuaded in their own minds: and we cannot be surprised if at length they become

regardless of law, through indignation at being constantly treated as lawless, by those who are in authority.

We are more concerned with the second point, the position of the officiating priest at the celebration of the Holy Communion. In the Mackonochie case, the Judicial Committee, wishing to prevent kneeling, or bending in adoration, before the consecrated bread and wine, determined that the words, 'standing before the table,' in the rubric, applied to the whole sentence, so that he must not kneel before its conclusion. And this was supposed to determine that he must stand before the table, but in the Folkstone case that inference is not allowed, because, as it is said, the Committee were not thinking of the Eastward position, when they so decided. But the words, 'standing before the table,' either do, or do not, apply to the whole sentence, and the application cannot depend upon possible consequences.

In all the arguments, referring to the position of the celebrant, one fact seems to have been overlooked, which, although apparently trifling, appears to me to be not unimportant. The question is always simply, whether side and end may not be convertible terms? but in every edition of the Prayer Book that I have seen, from the earliest, we have North-side, (with a hyphen,) and never North side as two distinct words. Now, no printer would have printed this of his own accord, and therefore I apprehend that we have the North part of the West side clearly designated, for the commencement of the service. Neither was the use of the term, "South side," in the Coronation service, insisted upon, although *there* it most certainly means the *front* of the altar, towards the South, and not the South end. Then, again, the directions for the manual acts are constantly quoted, as if "before the people" applied to the cup as well as to the bread; but, inasmuch as these words refer exclusively to the bread, I think the inference is fair, that they were intended to prevent the practice, common at the present day in many churches, of cutting up the bread beforehand, and bringing in a confused heap of

small pieces, so that the breaking, which ought to be part of the act of consecration, can scarcely be performed at all. And the order is most perfectly obeyed, when the Priest stands in the centre of the Table, and thus in the presence of the people, acting on their behalf, breaks and consecrates the bread. Here he is, more truly than in any other position, "before the people," who are not to be supposed to be gazing at him, and watching his actions, but rather to be in spirit uniting with him in the consecration.

I have no doubt that, according to the rubric, the north part of the west side is the strictly proper place for the commencement of the service, although any minister may be justified in taking the North end instead of the side if he prefer it. But for the Priest, when saying the Prayer of Consecration, the centre of the table is the only position completely fulfilling the direction "to stand before the table;" and it has been found that this has been the practice of many now aged men, from the date of their ordination, long before the beginning of what is now called the ritualistic movement. The Priest stands there at the head, and as the representative, of the congregation, who are themselves to take part in the act of consecration by uttering a united "amen" at the end of the prayer.

You will expect me to speak of the proposed alteration of the marriage laws, as a matter in which we have all been more or less interested, for while there may be a diversity of opinion respecting it, I cannot understand any one treating with indifference legislation affecting, for good or for evil, the family life, or any member of the Church of England being unmoved by an attempt to legalize what she solemnly declares to be condemned by the Word of God. The Bill has been now rejected by a very small majority in the Senate, and avowedly with a view to its reintroduction in the next session, when its fate will doubtless depend upon the opinions of the people, expressed in the meantime by resolutions or petitions. It therefore behoves all who are zealous for the maintenance of the rule of God's law, to exert themselves

ought to be part
performed at all.
when the Priest
in the presence
and consecrates
in any other
to be supposed
ns, but rather
ecration.

eric, the north
place for the
minister may
of the side if
g the Prayer
only position
l before the
as been the
ate of their
hat is now
stands there
ngregation,
onsecration
prayer.

alteration
e have all
may be a
nderstand
affecting,
per of the
tempt to
nned by
ted by a
with a
hen its
of the
or peti-
for the
selves

in order to preserve our country, if possible, from a deliberate repudiation of its authority. We have to contend with the natural objection to all restrictions upon liberty, but such restrictions are indispensable to the existence of civilized society. All laws restricting individual liberty, for the benefit of society, are inconvenient and objectionable to some persons, but the good of the greater number is regarded, and in this case we maintain that many will suffer, while very few will be benefitted, by the proposed change. I am happy to find that the clergy of this Diocese are nearly unanimous in their opposition to the change; but it is my duty to enter fully into the subject, inasmuch as its supporters are strong and persistent, and I rely upon you to teach the people committed to your charge, who cannot be expected to be able to meet the arguments of our opponents unless they are thus instructed, and to help them to prepare Petitions, which may very properly be signed by women, as well as by men, since the former are especially interested in this case.

The first question to be considered is the origin of marriage. Is it a divine or merely a human institution? Are we furnished with rules or principles, in Holy Scripture, by which it is to be regulated, or is it merely a partnership depending upon human laws? In the latter case, we should still contend, that the present restrictions are beneficial, and that a change would be injurious. But I cannot understand how any one, admitting the authority of the New Testament, can doubt that marriage is essentially a divine institution, since it is written, "wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." And if so, it follows that man is not at liberty to legislate concerning it, according to his own pleasure, and we have to consider, What are the legitimate inferences from the principles enunciated? And we are to expect to find some revelation of God's will concerning the restrictions laid upon man with reference to marriage. The first consequence of the unity of man and wife is, that affinity is to

be treated as consanguinity. This is the interpretation adopted by the whole Church for 1500 years. It is distinctly laid down in the Canon of the Church of England, whereby the table of prohibited degrees is set forth, and it was determined by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster in 1643, which was not likely to be influenced by traditional interpretations. This decision was afterwards included in the Scotch Confession of Faith, that "marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word. The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred, nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred, nearer in blood than of her own."

The next step is to discover what degrees of consanguinity are a barrier to marriage according to the law of God, for we have no details in the New Testament, and unless the 18th chapter of Leviticus is our guide, we are actually left without any instruction as to the will of God in this important matter, so that, for aught we know, marriage may be lawful between parent and child, or brother and sister. I ask your particular attention to this fact, for having regard to it we must accept this chapter as an essential part of the revelation of God's will concerning marriage, which we dare not disregard. An endeavor has been made to evade the force of this chapter by the plea that it was part of the ceremonial law, but this is refuted by the repeated statements that the heathen were condemned for allowing the unions therein prohibited, and, if so, the precepts must be binding upon us Christians. It is written, "Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things, for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you. And the land is defiled, therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants." The principle is laid down in verse 6, "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him to uncover their nakedness;" and then several particular cases, some of affinity and some of consanguinity, are enumerated, in

which marriage is prohibited; whence we learn the meaning of "near of kin." That we must adopt the rule of interpretation laid down by Bishop Jewel is evident, "between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers is like analogy," for the marriage of a father with his daughter is not prohibited, except it be included in the prohibition of marriage between mother and son in verse 7. We have, in verse 16, a definite condemnation of marriage with a brother's wife, and therefore also of marriage with a wife's sister. Here we maintain that we have definite instructions which man has no power to modify; and nothing but a counter revelation can diminish their force. But it is said that verse 18 does indirectly allow marriage with a deceased wife's sister, by prohibiting it during her lifetime; and some persons have so far misunderstood the arguments as to suppose that we infer the prohibition from this verse. It is to be observed, therefore, that no inference whatever is deduced from it. The prohibition is inferred from verse 16, and we protest against every attempt to weaken the force of that inference by reference to verse 18, which, to say the least, is ambiguous, so that no supposed interpretation of it can nullify a positive precept. But it is held by many learned commentators that the marginal reading gives the true sense, the word sister being used merely to denote another woman, so that it is in fact a prohibition of polygamy. If it be urged that polygamy cannot have been condemned, because we have directions for the conduct of a man who had married two or more wives, we answer that we have similar directions with respect to divorce, and yet our Lord declared that it was only a temporary concession to the weakness of the Jews, "for the hardness of their hearts" being contrary to the will of God. Solomon had many wives, and yet there was a special command that the king should not multiply wives to himself. Much importance is attached to the fact that, according to Jewish commentators and authorities, marriage with a wife's sister was, and is, permitted, but there was a general tendency among

them to evade every restriction; and we know that they "made the word of God of none effect by their traditions." Being restricted to marriage among themselves, it was but natural that they should adopt such interpretations as would allow them the greatest liberty of choice within those limits. And it must ever be remembered, with respect to rules of conduct, that they are much more stringent under the Christian, than under the Jewish, dispensation, as contrasted the one with the other by our Lord.

Moreover, as Christians, we have to consider the interpretation adopted by the Church in the earliest ages; and we find that there has been, from the first, a general consensus as to the Scriptural prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. There is no trace of any such marriage in the first three centuries, and in the fourth, St. Basil wrote, "if a man has fallen into the sin of marrying two sisters, we do not regard such a union as marriage, nor do we receive the parties to communion with the Church until they are separated." We have repeated condemnations of these marriages, until towards the end of the fifteenth century, a dispensation to marry his late wife's sister was granted by the infamous Rhoderic Borgia (Pope Alexander VI.) to Emanuel, King of Portugal. Since that time, and especially since the Council of Trent, the right to grant such dispensations has been assumed, but only, as laid down, under special circumstances. It appears that at first the Pope was held to have authority to dispense even with the observance of Scriptural precepts, as those concerning marriage were always held to be, but in the course of time Roman Catholic writers have changed their ground, and argue that, since the Pope grants these dispensations, the prohibitions cannot be part of the Law of God. This argument can have no weight with us; and we may say that the whole Church condemns these marriages, for in the Greek Church they are not allowed under any circumstances, the Roman Branch condemns them, although claiming the right to grant dispen

sations, and the Irish Branch unites with the English in declaring them to be contrary to the Law of God, which declaration is also contained in the Confession of Faith of the Scotch Presbyterians.

Much misapprehension prevails with respect to the law affecting these marriages in England. It has been stated, that they were not illegal before the passage of Lord Lyndhurst's Act in 1835, but the House of Lords, the highest Court of Appeal, decided that they were absolutely void; and Lord Hatherley, whose authority as a lawyer no one will dispute, lately affirmed that there had been no change in the law of England in that respect since the baptism of Ethelbert. Again, it has been maintained that Lord Lyndhurst's Act declared the validity of all marriages before the date of its enactment, while it made all subsequent marriages void, and that the present law therefore cannot be based upon divine authority, but this is an error. That Act did not profess to make such marriages valid or even legal. It enacted merely that, whereas the law had been in an anomalous condition, the sentence of a Court being necessary to annul them, they should thenceforth be *ipso facto*, null and void, but that marriages which had taken place under the old Law should not be annulled. It did not enact that these existing unions should be to all intents and purposes good and valid, and that the parties should be screened from punishment in the Ecclesiastical Court, but only, in fact, that the children should not be illegitimate. Upon this point the following language of that eminent Judge, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, is conclusive, "if we look to the preamble of the Act, it is not for the protection of the parties who have been guilty of the offence, for such it is by the Ecclesiastical law and by the law of God, but for the protection of the children; for that is the purpose and object of the Act, to settle the estate and condition of the innocent issue of such marriages, not to screen the delinquent parties. The law of God cannot be altered by man. The Legislature may exempt the parties from punishment,

it may legalize, humanly speaking, every prohibited act, and give effect to any contract, however inconsistent with the divine law, but it cannot change the character of the act itself, which remains as it was, and must always so remain, whatever be the effect of the Act of Parliament." Would that our legislators would lay to heart these well-considered words of the learned Judge, and that the people of this country may be brought to acknowledge that the Bill, which has been supported by a large majority of their representatives, cannot alter the character of the unions, which it is proposed to legalize, but may involve the country in the guilt of direct antagonism to the will of God.

I have thus far spoken more particularly of the marriage mentioned in the title of the Bill lately rejected, and which alone has been discussed in the British Parliament; but you must remember, and your people should be made clearly to understand this, that the Bill was to legalize also the marriage of a man with his brother's widow, a marriage considered so abominable in England that last year one of the speakers in the House of Lords used, in opposition to a Bill then before it, the argument that if passed it would soon be followed by another to legalize the marriage of a woman with two brothers successively. This is true that the two cases must be similarly treated; and if a man be allowed to marry two sisters, the woman must be permitted to marry two brothers; but very many persons who approve of the one most heartily condemn the other. And there is no doubtful verse respecting the brother's widow; the prohibition is distinct; but then, it is said, in one particular case, it was enjoined, and therefore it cannot be in itself evil. Will any one maintain, that it would not be evil, that it would not be murder, after the capture of a city, to destroy every living being, even the infant children, in it? and yet God commanded the extermination of the Amalekites. Because the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, the children of Adam and Eve, was commanded, would such an abomination be per-

missible now? With a special object, under certain conditions, in the positive laws of the Jews, a man was called upon to marry the widow of his brother, not for the gratification of his own passions, but only that a family might not be extinguished in Israel. It was only when there had been no issue of the former marriage, and the surviving brother was then so substituted for the deceased, that the first-born son was to be called the son of the deceased brother, and not of his actual father. Moreover, lest this command should be misunderstood or construed as a sanction for the infringement of the prohibition in other cases, God affixed a special token of His displeasure to its violation; "if a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing, they shall die childless." We have, therefore, an absolute condemnation of such a union, as a thing not to be tolerated, even among the heathen, when adopted for personal gratification, but a sanction of it under the peculiar code of laws of the Israelites, in one particular case; and even in this case, according to the Mishna, if the surviving brother were a widower, and the widow the sister of his own deceased wife, he was not permitted to marry her. Lastly, it has been urged by some that since the marriage tie is dissolved by death, the relationship derived from that union must also come to an end. But if this were so, then a man might marry a deceased wife's mother or daughter, since there would be no affinity after the wife's death. Moreover, this argument is refuted by the precepts of that chapter of Leviticus applicable to cases where the death of the wife is evidently implied, and presupposed. Let us not, then, my Reverend Brethren, argue about the Divine counsels, but rather let us thankfully accept, and act upon, the rules which our God has given us, and the intimation that they were intended for the whole world, and were not at all restricted to the Jews.

Assuming that marriages within certain degrees are prohibited, by the Law of God, it is superfluous to consider whether we think them expedient or inexpedient; but it

may be well briefly to treat of this point, and to show that a change of the law must be attended with disastrous effect, and for this reason I may repeat language which has already appeared in print:—

It is commonly argued that the Aunt is the most suitable person to take charge of the motherless children, and for this very reason we deprecate all legislation allowing the possibility of marriage with the widower. At present an unmarried sister may take the wife's place in the household, during illness, without giving any occasion for jealousy or suspicion of any kind, and in case of death she is at hand consoling the bereaved family, and ministering to the children. But make marriage possible, and the wife, dying after a protracted illness, may be harassed with the terrible suspicion that husband and sister, having become attached to one another during their long daily familiar intercourse, are looking for her death; and in any case the motherless children must be deprived of the loving care of the unmarried aunt, at the very time when it would be most valuable; for if she is no longer to be regarded as the widower's own sister, she will shrink from the appearance of thrusting herself upon him. Moreover, even if he be disposed to have her, and she is willing to become his second wife, no one would advocate their union until after the lapse of a decent period; and in the meantime she could not with greater propriety be an inmate of the house than any other young woman could be. The probability is that, while a change in the law would injuriously affect the position of every wife's sister, with reference to the husband, both in the wife's lifetime, and also in case of her death, there are few cases in which they would actually choose to intermarry, and fewer still in which, after having children of her own, she would be better than any other step-mother to her nephews and nieces.

The example of the United States, and of countries on the continent of Europe, is often adduced as worthy of imitation; but we have yet to learn, what evidence can be adduced to prove that the happiness of family life is increased in those countries, by the absence of restrictions upon marriage, or that in fact it can be compared with the family life in England. And it is to be observed that the relaxation does not stop at wife's sister or brother's widow, but extends to uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews, while facilities for divorce are painfully multiplied. Another

Bill will certainly, we may assume, be introduced in the next session, and we cannot then plead that we are unprepared, so that we must exert ourselves if we would save our country from the crime of fighting against God. And I hope that we may be supported by many who have hitherto stood aloof, both Roman Catholics and Protestants.

We have been lately assured on the highest authority,* that in Scotland both the Old Kirk and the Free Church are agreed in opposing any change; so that the people are almost unanimous in their opposition. How to account for the apathy of the Presbyterians here, descended from men who were ever ready to shed their blood in defence of their religious convictions, I know not; but I hope that, after a full consideration of the terms of their own confession of faith, they will feel themselves bound to maintain its prohibitions, and to oppose vigorously every attempt to involve the Dominion in the guilt of sanctioning what they profess to believe that God has condemned. Would that they were all actuated by the sentiments expressed in "An Address to the Nonconformist ministers of England, by ministers of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland," and the agitators for a change in the law would certainly be defeated. I observe with much satisfaction that, at the late General Assembly of the Presbyterians of the Dominion, a Committee was appointed to oppose any attempt in Parliament to alter the law.

The differences as to the interpretation of Leviticus xviii: 18, are commonly adduced to invalidate the Scriptural argument, by persons who would not act avowedly in defiance of Scripture, and therefore I repeat, that our argument is not based upon that verse, and is not influenced by it, since its interpretation is uncertain, and that, in any case, there are no such differences with respect to the condemnation of the marriage of a woman with two brothers, which is expressed in distinct unambiguous language.

It is much to be regretted that the non-Episcopal bodies,

* Swinburne's speech at the meeting, February 23th, in London.

with the exception of the Presbyterians, (both in Ireland and in Scotland,) are generally opposed to the restrictions, whether because they are supposed to depend on church tradition I cannot say; but as they profess to be guided by the same Scriptures to which we defer, I cannot understand why they should be of a different opinion from ourselves, with reference to the unions therein expressly condemned. The Wesleyan Methodists, however, appear to agree with us, for a few years ago, having occasion to communicate with the President of the Methodist Conference of these Provinces, he sent me the following extract from the laws of that body: "That in unison with the general stream of authorities, in both Jewish and Christian Churches, the ecclesiastical law of the country, ever since the epoch of the Reformation, has affirmed the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within the limits of which the Divine Lawgiver has prohibited marriage, to be such as are expressed or implied in Leviticus xviii., and that therefore such marriages alone are godly and agreeable to law which are contracted between persons not included in those prohibitions."

In connection with this matter, the nature of our obligations under the Canons of 1603 has been discussed, and a brief notice of them may be useful. These, adopted by the Houses of Convocation, were ratified by the King, but have not the authority of Parliament, and therefore, although binding the clergy, do not bind the laity, according to Lord Hardwicke's judgment, *proprio vigore*; but his Lordship added, "I say *proprio vigore*, by their own force and authority, for there are many provisions contained in these Canons, which are declaratory of the ancient usage and law of the Church of England, received and allowed here which in that respect, and by virtue of such ancient allowance, will bind the laity." Some of these Canons are obsolete, and some are inapplicable to our circumstances, but we may be guided by their spirit, if not by the letter in some cases; and it may perhaps be desirable, to have the whole of them examined, and such of them retained,

as may be approved by the Provincial Synod. In the meantime, there can be no question, as to the force of the 99th Canon affirming the table of prohibited degrees, for it was adopted by the Provincial Synod at its last Session, and is therefore binding on all members of the Church, whether lay or clerical, in this Ecclesiastical Province. Even, therefore, if any of the prohibited marriages were to be allowed by the civil law, no Clergyman of our Church could solemnize such a marriage, or knowingly admit to the Holy Communion persons so married, without rendering himself liable to ecclesiastical censure. We must ever bear in mind the solemn warning, addressed to those who come to be married, "be ye well assured, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's word doth allow, are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful."

The call to celebrate this year the Centenary of the establishment of Sunday Schools, suggests the propriety of saying a few words with reference to them, and on the subject of education generally. Our common school system is maintained at a great expense, and we have for many years had provision made so that no child, even of the poorest parents, need be without the advantage of elementary instruction, but unhappily it is purely a secular system; and I fear that the ill effects of such a system will, sooner or later, be practically felt throughout the Province. Knowledge is power; and if we train the intellectual faculties, neglecting the moral and spiritual, we are preparing for ourselves a multitude of clever evil-doers. If all who recognize the importance of the religious element, in any system of instruction, would unite in bringing their influence to bear upon the Government and the Legislature, I am persuaded that some modification might be introduced, so as to allow the ministers of the several denominations to instruct the children of their own flocks during a specified portion of the school hours. In default of this, and while things remain as they are, the Sunday School is the best substitute, and should have all

the attention that you can bestow upon it. I am aware, my brethren, that some of you, working in country places, have much difficulty in this respect, having to spend so much time on the Lord's Day in travelling from one station to another that you cannot be present in the school, while there is sometimes an additional obstacle also in the want of teachers, and especially of any fit person for the office of superintendent. I am aware, too, that some persons object to Sunday Schools, because parents consider themselves thereby relieved from the duty of imparting religious instruction to their children, and again, because wrong views are cherished in the children themselves by concentrating this instruction on one day out of seven, while there is no trace of it in the school-teaching of the other days of the week, as though religion were proper for the Lord's Day only, and should not influence the general life and conversation. But without discussing these objections, whether they be well or ill-founded, we still have the fact, that we are bound to see that the children have some teaching beyond that which is merely for this world, and there is no agency but the Sunday School through which this can be secured. If, therefore, our Sunday Schools are necessarily in many places imperfect in their organization, and although at the best they may fail to accomplish all that we would desire, we are bound nevertheless to avail ourselves of an agency, for which nothing better can be substituted; and every Pastor should do all in his power to make it profitable for the lambs of his flock. The efficiency of the school will be materially increased by a class for the instruction of the teachers, preparatory to the work of the following Sunday, wherever it may be possible to bring them together.

There is a prevalent practice, against which you cannot too strenuously protest, of sending girls to the Convents for their education. Parents, naturally disliking the associations of the Common Schools for their daughters, look for some more satisfactory mode of education, and are induced in many cases, it is to be feared by con-

siderations of economy, without regard to other things, to select a Convent as a day school, or even as a boarding school. At one time, the plea was, that they had no alternative, that they availed themselves of the Convent, because they had no other resource, but this can no longer be urged. It is true, I am sorry to say, that I have long endeavored, to no purpose, to induce members of the Church to bestir themselves, and make such provision for the girls, as they have already made for boys at Windsor, and as Methodists and Baptists have made for *their* girls. There is a sad, very discreditable apathy in this matter, and the contrast of the earnestness of other bodies is a grievous reproach to us, but private enterprise has partially supplied the want, and we have in this city two schools, either of which will receive and educate boarders at a very low rate. One of these, St. Margaret's Hall, has been recognised, by the Synod, as a Diocesan School, the Bishop being *ex officio* Visitor, but no aid has been given by the Church, the Principal having been left to bear the entire burden and responsibility of making this needful provision, and being hampered by the want of adequate accommodation. In either of these schools, I believe that a superior and solid education may be obtained; but as Visitor, I am able to speak more particularly of the Hall. And I urge you, most earnestly, to do your utmost to impress your people with a sense of the impropriety and danger of sending their daughters to the Convents. The supposition that a better education can be obtained in them than in our own schools is entirely erroneous, and I speak after careful investigation; but even if it were so, and if a few dollars might thus be saved, nothing can justify exposing the girls to the evil consequences of such a practice. They will acquire a tendency either to Romanism or to indifference. As a general rule, the boarders are not allowed to attend their own Churches; even on the Lord's Day they are required to attend, although not to take part in, the services in the Convent Chapels. And no lover of the truth can doubt that this must be exceedingly injurious,

whether they join in the worship or not, and yet we find persons professing themselves most thoroughly opposed to the errors of Romanism, actually, from low and unworthy motives, (to avoid trouble or expense), exposing their daughters to temptation and danger. They might learn a lesson, from the caution of the Romanists, who will not allow domestic servants to attend the family worship of persons not of their own faith, although the servants so attending, would have nothing offensive presented to them, would not be called upon to take part in any supplications, contrary to their own belief. But the child, in a Roman Seminary, must both see and hear what is or ought to be most offensive to every one outside of that system, the images of the blessed Virgin set before them, as the queen of Heaven, instead of the meek and lowly maiden, described in Holy Scripture, while invocations of the Virgin, and of the Saints, are mingled with all the prayers and ejaculations, which ought to be addressed to God alone. From the infection of an atmosphere thus contaminated, even the day scholars cannot altogether escape, and all may be expected, in the course of time, either to be attracted by the system, or to acquire a habit of contemptuous indifference to the worship of their companions.

It is to be remembered, moreover, that every pupil sent contributes to the support and prosperity of these schools, instead of strengthening our own Institutions. Nevertheless, we find persons of extreme Protestant sentiments, of all denominations of Christians, thus aiding the seminaries established for the propagation of the system against which they verbally protest; and I can imagine, although I cannot describe, the contempt with which such persons substantially supporting, in order to save a few dollars, what they profess to condemn, must be regarded by those who receive their money.

While I particularly enforce your duty, with reference to the education of the younger members of your flocks, to provide what is good, and preserve them from exposure

to objectionable influences, I must also add a word of caution with reference to your people generally. The members of our Communion are comparatively few in this Province, and still fewer in Prince Edward Island. We are surrounded by opponents, and through their misrepresentations, and through the baneful influence of intermarriages, some of our own members are seduced from their allegiance mainly, as it appears to me, in consequence of defective instruction. It has often been remarked that members of the Church of England seem to know less about their own system than others, and to hold to it rather from affection and habit than from conviction, and where this is the case there can be no doubt that the training has been defective. In the Sunday School, and in catechizing, where this valuable mode of instruction can be practised the foundation should be laid; and in lectures and addresses, if not in ordinary sermons, the divine origin and apostolic organization of the Church should be explained, and the claims of our Branch to be most truly the representative of that original should be enforced. This is stigmatized by some as arrogance and presumption, but we cannot ignore the fact, that the leading English Reformers adopted, and acted upon, the sound principle that the doctrine and discipline of the early ages should be, as far as possible, restored. We must not be so ungrateful as to lightly esteem the goodness of our Heavenly Father in thus guarding and directing those whom he raised up as his instruments in England, as contrasted with the agents in other countries. We, therefore, thankfully acknowledge and proclaim this His special mercy to our Mother Land, and we should feel that, whatever imputations we may thus incur, we are bound to maintain and to proclaim the position which He has vouchsafed to us. I fear that many, even of our own people, suppose that the Reformed Church originated in the Reformation, unconscious that the word itself is evidence to the contrary, since that which is reformed must have previously existed.

Whenever we assemble for public worship, we affirm

our belief in the Holy Catholic Church, or in one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and the meaning of this Article should be clearly explained, combined with the reminder, that any surrender of our claim, to be a branch of that Church, must be a condemnation of our present position. The Apostolic Church must have a clear succession, and continuity through all ages, from the times of the Apostles. And our high appreciation of the value of membership with it is due, not to our admiration of its system and tenets, nor to our own judgment of its merits, but to the fact that it is a divine institution. There are variations from the original constitution, both in excess and in defect, and while we refrain from pronouncing judgment upon the individuals who adhere to either, we cannot but warn those who have known the better way, who have enjoyed the blessing of the happy mean, of their sin and danger, if they depart from the path marked out for them. They who, in God's providence, have had their lot cast, where there is no certainty as to the commission of the ministers, or where they are deprived of some of the means of grace, may have these defects compensated by Him who will accept every man according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not. But we cannot thus hopefully regard any who wilfully abandon privileges vouchsafed to them by their Heavenly Father. And they most especially appear to be in a hopeless state, who, having been partakers of the body and blood of Christ, according to His own institution, wilfully relinquish their privilege, and, embracing Roman errors, accept in its stead a mutilated sacrament, which is, therefore, probably *no* sacrament; so that whereas St. Paul teaches us, that "the cup of blessing is the communion of the blood of Christ," they who, abandoning our communion, join the Church of Rome, wilfully relinquish the use of the means whereby we are permitted to partake of that blood, concerning which we are taught to pray, that we may so drink His blood, that our souls may be washed through it. Probably the awful guilt thus incurred is seldom considered by

those who are tempted favorably to regard the Roman system. But the fact that Rome has presumed to tamper with, and to change the matter of, one of the Holy Sacraments instituted by Christ himself, condemns the system absolutely, and without further investigation is sufficient to prove that she has departed so widely from the truth that no one who has been rightly instructed can, without imperilling his soul, join himself to her. The doctrine of transubstantiation, as defined by the Council of Trent, is that the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood, of Christ. The next step is the assumption that, where there is a part there must be the whole, and, therefore, that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Christ, are all present in either kind. But, practically, this is applied only to the one kind, the species of bread; and the whole Christ is held to be contained in each particle of the bread, so that there may be as many Christs upon the altar as there are elementary particles, or indivisible atoms of flour.

We, however, dare not assume that any alteration may be made in what our Lord himself hath instituted, we dare not admit any inference implying that the Church may dispense with a portion of his command, and substitute a part for the whole, acting on the conclusions of human reason in that which should simply be accepted as a transcendent mystery,

We have been so free from perversions to Romanism in this Diocese that it may appear to be superfluous to utter any warnings against it, but I am bound to do so, because I am aware of attempts made to seduce some from the old paths, and of the circulation of books containing Roman, instead of Catholic, doctrine. And I must warn you, my brethren, to beware of giving occasion, by word or deed, for the supposition that the differences are not essential, or that the space between us may be bridged over. We are not, indeed, to condemn or reject any doctrine or practice simply because it is held or used in the Roman

Church, for it may have been retained, and have come down from primitive times. But we, who have witnessed the addition, to the faith of two new Articles within the space of a few years, have thus learned how easily novelties may have been introduced and adopted in the course of ages, and are without excuse for deferring to her authority in any matter. She boasts of her antiquity, but by her successive innovations, and additions to the faith, she has forfeited all claim to respect on that account; and by her latest decree she has not only adulterated the creed, but has actually adopted a new rule of faith altogether. Formerly she professed to be guided by the Holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the Fathers, and by General Councils, but her rule of faith is no longer thus guarded, and her doctrine depends upon the *ex cathedra* utterances of the Bishop of Rome; so that, in fact, she has thus made herself the most modern of all the sects of the present day, for, even though she *may* still hold to the same doctrines as before, that is merely accidental, and the adoption of a new rule of faith virtually creates a new religion.

I must particularly warn you of the danger of circulating among your people, or in any way sanctioning, Books of Devotion, which, apparently valuable in some respects, nevertheless countenance, indirectly, if not directly, such corruptions as the invocation of saints, and especially of the Virgin Mary; for, without discussing the question, whether such invocation can practically be preserved from abuse, and so restricted as not to trench upon the divine attributes, we cannot reconcile it with the Catholic doctrine of the condition of the departed, between death and the resurrection, as in Paradise, but not in Heaven. We have here a striking example of the way in which frequently extremes meet, the popular theology treating of the souls of the faithful as in Heaven, immediately after death, while the Roman system affirms the same, of those who are by it recognized as saints, so that being before the throne of God they can intercede with him on behalf of the dwellers upon earth. But the

Catholic doctrine is that *all*, including even the Blessed Virgin, are in an imperfect intermediate state of rest and refreshment, and we pray for them that they may speedily have "their perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul." The human soul of our Blessed Lord was in Paradise, not in Heaven, while absent from the body, and the assumption that it may be otherwise with the souls of His saints, is a dangerous, unwarrantable error.

You may, perhaps, expect me, to speak of the various opinions concerning the future state, which are now freely discussed, but it appears to me that the questions involved are rather theoretical than practical. For it is generally held that they who die in the faith and fear of God will enjoy eternal happiness, and that they who have not been prepared for His presence, in this state of probation, and who have been rebellious and disobedient, must suffer the penalty due to transgression. The question is whether the terms 'eternal' and 'everlasting,' when applied to punishment, have the same signification as when applied to reward, whether that punishment may be terminated after some indefinite period by annihilation, or may have such a reforming and purifying effect that it may be no longer necessary. Many are making the doctrine of eternal punishment a plea for rejecting revelation altogether, and we may believe that some honest enquirers are unable to reconcile it with their views concerning the nature and attributes of the Creator. But are they able any better to reconcile the undoubted facts of the permitted introduction and continuance of wickedness and misery among mankind? Let there be a belief in the existence of a God, and there must be the admission that His ways will probably be beyond the range of the creature's faculties, but that the same principles of government, or of dealing with men, will prevail in the future as in the present life. Assuming that you receive the interpretations of Scripture generally adopted by the Church, I would nevertheless point out to you that you may deal tenderly with those who, honestly accepting the teaching

of Holy Scripture, yet believe that its language will bear a different interpretation, and that the received doctrine is inconsistent with the attributes of an Almighty loving Creator. With those who deny the doctrine of a future state of retribution, we can have no sympathy whatever, for they contradict the teaching both of reason and of revelation. But we may treat with tenderness the opinions of those who, recognizing the justice as well as the love of God, and admitting the stern denunciations and threatenings of Holy Writ, entertain a hope and belief that, *somewhere* in the interminable ages of eternity, the complete deliverance of the universe from evil and from misery may be effected.

We hold that "everlasting" means lasting for ever, and that "eternal" is never ending, but we cannot deny that such expressions are sometimes used with limitations, and we should not absolutely condemn any interpretation which does not actually eliminate their meaning. With respect to such views, however, I have said that the question is more theoretical than practical, because it is admitted that the punishment of transgression, if not literally eternal, may extend in any case over ages and thousands of ages, and such duration, with respect to any individual sinner, appears practically eternal. You may, therefore, instead of encouraging a spirit of antagonism by indiscriminately condemning or opposing such persons, rather point out that, supposing their views to be true, no encouragement whatever is afforded to the transgressor, since unquestionably, whether there may or may not be reason to hope for an amelioration of the condition of the lost in the far distant future, the language, both of our Lord and of his Apostles, is intended to convey the knowledge of a terrible retribution, of inconceivable misery, and of incalculable duration, awaiting the impenitent and disobedient, who have sinned against light and knowledge, who have "done despite to the spirit of grace." And we may learn a lesson from the divine wisdom which, in answer to the question, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" replied, "Strive to enter in at the

strait gate, for many I say unto you will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." No direct answer is given to the speculative query, but an earnest warning and exhortation is addressed to the individual.

We have, moreover, the definite teaching that in Hades, in the intermediate state, there is no passing from the one portion to the other, a great, impassable gulf being fixed between them, so that at the judgment the reunited, compound being must be judged according to the deeds done in the body, its position being then assigned in Heaven or Hell. But whether there may be in Paradise any growth, any purifying process whereby progressive sanctification may be accomplished, we are not informed. Certainly the primitive teaching was in favor of it, and all the ancient liturgies contain prayers for the faithful departed. We have them no longer in a direct form, but in the burial service we have a prayer on behalf of the faithful departed, that we and they may speedily attain to our perfect consummation and bliss; and the learned Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in 1838, gave judgment in the Arches Court that if it had been the opinion of the framers of the Articles and Canons of the Church that prayers for the dead were opposed to the Scriptures, they would have expressly declared their illegality, and many of our most honored divines have held that such prayers are not prohibited by the Church of England, and that they *could* not be so while we have the example of St. Paul's prayer on behalf of the deceased Onesiphorus, "the Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day."

That such prayers are not directly countenanced, although not prohibited, in our Services, is probably due to the abuses, which prevailed under the Roman system, and to their supposed connection with the figment of purgatory. Even in this enlightened age, and among educated people, many are to be found unable to distinguish between purgatory, and the Catholic doctrine of the intermediate state, between prayers for the faithful departed, and prayers for a change of condition of those who have died

estranged from God. The Roman doctrine of purgatory is so revolting, as well as opposed to Scripture and Catholic tradition, that we cannot be surprised at the reaction, when men's eyes were opened, and at the present dread of every approach to such a doctrine. The doctrine of Holy Scripture is, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, that there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, that the believer, absent from the body, is present with the Lord, and they who die in the Lord rest from their labours; and we can rejoice in the assurance, that death is indeed a happy release to the child of God, whose agonies we have witnessed on the bed of sickness and suffering. But, according to Roman teaching, that sufferer only exchanges bodily suffering, for torments far more dreadful in the separate state. She has invented a purgatory, of which there is no trace to be found in the writings of the Christian Fathers, any more than in the divine revelation, a purgatory of penal suffering, through which even the elect must pass. And Cardinal Bellarmine affirms the general opinion of divines to be, that the pains of the souls in purgatory are of the same kind and intensity as those of the damned, differing only as to their duration. And bearing in mind, that all the children of God must be subjected to this purifying fire, before they can be fitted for heaven, we cannot be surprised, that the consideration of this doctrine has produced a thorough revulsion of feeling, and that the truth has suffered, because the true and the false doctrine have been confounded by the multitude.

In conclusion, my Rev. brethren, I must enforce for myself as well as for you, the warning that "the time is short," and that we must, each of us, work while it is called to-day. Some of us are far advanced in years, and some are just beginning their ministry; but a great work has been committed to us, and we have to make the most of the time allotted to us, whether more or less be still remaining. It may be that in some respects, owing to greater facilities for travelling, and the spread of education, the

work is easier than it was, because the instruction given is addressed to minds more capable of comprehending and profiting by it; but on the other hand, these facilities tend to make your people unsettled, and the modicum of instruction which they receive is apt to make many self-conceited, proud of their acquirements, and unwilling to submit to the authoritative teaching, which at one time they would have received with undoubting trust. Scepticism has to be met and combatted, and the spiritual Pastor should be prepared, not only with defensive armor, but also with weapons "mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." Your inability to confute a specious cavil or plausible objection to some tenet, may be a serious stumbling-block in the way, not only of the caviller, but of many others also who may hear of your defeat. And especially let us remember our ordination vow, to be as far as possible "wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ." Even in the use of things lawful, we must practise temperance and moderation, and consider the opinions of others as well as satisfy our own consciences, and especially, let even the youngest brethren beware of everything approaching to levity in their actions, and even in their conversation.

It is not sufficient that we have regular, attentive, and well-conducted congregations, unless there is also spiritual life among them. We must be careful to lay a good, substantial foundation, but we have also the responsibility of building upon it. The first great object of the Christian ministry should be the saving of souls, the conversion of the large proportion of the baptized who are not walking worthy of their vocation, who are not led by the Spirit of God. Such must be awakened, taught to understand the heinousness of their sin, and exhorted with true contrition to turn unto the Lord, seeking to be renewed by the Holy Ghost. Let there be no mis-apprehension as to his condition on the part of the baptized sinner, let him be distinctly instructed that he is not delivered from condemnation by his baptism, that on the contrary his responsibility and his

guilt are much aggravated thereby ; but, on the other hand, he may be encouraged to return to his Father, seeking a restoration to favor, by the knowledge that he was once adopted as a Son, that the promises and invitations are addressed to him, and that, on fulfilment of the conditions, he may confidently prefer a claim to them, And there is room for much earnest work among those also who are walking in the narrow way, who are on the Christian course, for they need to be stirred up, and to be led on to a higher life. Let us study carefully the descriptions of the Christian life, as set before us in the Epistles, and we cannot but feel that much is still lacking amongst us. Let us not be content with routine work, but rather try all means whereby the spiritual life of ourselves and of our flocks may be quickened, and rendered more definite and decided. May the Holy Spirit be so poured out upon you, my brethren, that you may, with power and wisdom, convince the gainsayers, and edify the believers, so faithfully feeding the flock of Christ, performing all pastoral duties that, when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye may receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

hand,
king a
s once
ns are
itions,
ere is
o are
istian
on to
ns of
d we
Let
y all
f our
and
you,
dom,
faith-
toral
may